

§ 10005.20

multiple years, or deferred if doing otherwise would preclude other worthwhile but lower cost projects.

§ 10005.20 Project evaluation procedures.

Projects proposed for inclusion in the plan will be subjected to a systematic evaluation using the decision factors delineated in §10005.19. The Commission may, at any time in the project evaluation process, contact applicants to ask for clarification, to propose modifications, or to otherwise cause the formulation of project proposals that are in keeping with the Commission's authority and mission. The result of the evaluation will be a preliminary list of eligible projects, arrayed by year over the term of the plan. The evaluation will adhere to the following process:

(a) Each project will be arrayed according to location (by watershed), project type, and the resource that the project seeks to address.

(b) Each project's consistency with Commission policy delineated in §10005.12 will be determined.

(c) Complementary, competing, and duplicative projects will be identified. (If warranted, applicants may be asked to combine efforts or otherwise modify projects.)

(d) Projects that satisfy obligations described in §10005.8 will be identified.

(e) Using best professional judgement, Commission staff will evaluate each project according to the standards delineated in §10005.19 with the exception of Decision Factor 6, which relates to the Commission's overall portfolio and is, therefore, not applicable to the evaluation of a specific project.

(1) For each standard, a preliminary rating will be made, with the project rated as:

- (i) Exceeding minimum standard,
- (ii) Meeting minimum standard,
- (iii) Minor deficiency in meeting standard,
- (iv) Deficient, or
- (v) Not applicable.

(2) Commission ratings will be contrasted to those of applicants and major discrepancies re-evaluated. Commission findings will be recorded and will be available for review.

43 CFR Ch. III (10–1–02 Edition)

(f) Each project will be given an overall rating based on the extent to which it meets Commission criteria as defined in paragraphs (b) through (e) of this section. The rating will be made on the basis of best professional judgement using quantitative and/or qualitative rating techniques as appropriate. A given project need not meet all standards to be selected for inclusion in the Commission's plan. A project may, for example, be deficient in an area that the Commission determines is not important for that type of project or, alternatively, deficiencies in some areas may be off-set by major assets in others. A tiered rating scale will be used, with projects grouped into two or more categories according to how well they meet Commission criteria.

(g) Projects with moderate to high ratings will then be re-evaluated from a multiple project perspective. Decision Factor 6, Compatibility with the Commission's Overall Program, will be the focus of this evaluation. For those areas with a concentration of projects this might involve a watershed-wide analysis. It will also involve a state-wide analysis. As with the previous step, the evaluation will be conducted using best professional judgement and may involve a variety of applicable techniques.

§ 10005.21 Amending the plan.

The Commission considers the plan to be a dynamic instrument that guides decisions over time and is capable of responding to changing circumstances. Amendments to the plan provide the vehicle for maintaining this dynamic quality.

(a) *Types of plan amendment.* The Commission recognizes three distinct types of plan amendment: comprehensive revisions, substantive revisions, and technical revisions. The particulars regarding each is as follows:

(1) *Comprehensive revision.* The Act requires that the Commission "develop and adopt" a plan every five years. At the end of each five year period the Commission will undertake a comprehensive review of the plan to determine its adequacy and the need for revision. The need to revise, and add to, the Commission's portfolio of proposed